

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 SEO DEVELOPMENT, LLC, et al.,

CASE NO. C18-1551JLR

11 Plaintiffs,

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
REGARDING SUBJECT
MATTER JURISDICTION

12 v.

13 GORDON THOMAS
14 HONEYWELL, LLP, et al.,

Defendants.

15 The court has reviewed Plaintiffs SEO Development, LLC, Ann Anderson, and
16 Edwin Xavier Vicioso's (collectively, "Plaintiffs") complaint (Compl. (Dkt. # 1)) and
17 finds that Plaintiffs do not plead facts that demonstrate the court's subject matter
18 jurisdiction.

19 Plaintiffs assert that the court's subject matter jurisdiction is based on diversity of
20 citizenship. (*Id.* ¶¶ 35-41.) Defendant Gordon Thomas Honeywell, LLP ("Gordon
21 Thomas"), is a law firm apparently organized as a limited liability partnership. (*See id.*
22

1 ¶ 38.) For purposes of assessing diversity jurisdiction, the court must consider the
2 domicile of all members or partners of a limited liability partnership. *Johnson v.*
3 *Columbia Props. Anchorage, LP*, 437 F.3d 894, 899 (9th Cir. 2006) (“[L]ike a
4 partnership, an LLC is a citizen of every state of which its owners/members are
5 citizens.”); *Guaranty v. Nat'l Title Co.*, 101 F.3d 57, 59 (7th Cir. 1996) (“To determine
6 the citizenship of the [limited liability partnership], we need to know the name and
7 citizenship(s) of its general and limited partners.”); *Carden v. Arkoma Assocs.*, 494 U.S.
8 185, 189 (1990) (treating a limited partnership as having the citizenship of all its
9 members); *see also* Local Rules W.D. Wash. LCR 8(a) (“If plaintiff is asserting that this
10 court has jurisdiction based on diversity, the complaint must identify the citizenship of
11 the parties, and, if any of the parties is a limited liability corporation (LLC), a limited
12 liability partnership (LLP), or a partnership, identify the citizenship of the
13 owners/partners/members of those entities to establish the court’s jurisdiction.”).
14 Plaintiffs allege that Gordon Thomas “has the citizenship of Washington for diversity
15 purposes.” (Compl. ¶ 38.) However, Plaintiffs do not allege the domicile of Gordon
16 Thomas’s members or partners. (*See generally id.*) Accordingly, the court cannot
17 conclude that it has subject matter jurisdiction over this action.¹

19

20 ¹ Although Plaintiffs have the burden of establishing grounds for diversity jurisdiction,
21 the court also has the obligation to satisfy itself that it has subject matter jurisdiction over a case
22 and to address the issue *sua sponte* if necessary. *See Snell v. Cleveland, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 822, 826
(9th Cir. 2002) (citing Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3)); *accord United States v. S. Cal. Edison Co.*, 300
F. Supp. 2d 964, 972 (E.D. Cal. 2004) (“The [c]ourt ‘ha[s] an independent obligation to address
sua sponte whether [it] has subject-matter jurisdiction.’” (quoting *Dittman v. California*, 191
F.3d 1020, 1025 (9th Cir. 1999))).

1 The court ORDERS Plaintiffs to SHOW CAUSE within fourteen (14) days of the
2 filing of this order why its complaint should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter
3 jurisdiction. To the extent Plaintiffs' response alters the allegations in its complaint,
4 Plaintiffs must amend their complaint accordingly. If Plaintiffs fail to timely and
5 adequately comply with this order, the court will dismiss the case without prejudice and
6 without leave to amend.

Dated this 8th day of November, 2018.



JAMES L. ROBART
United States District Judge